

**Remarks/Arguments:**

Claims 1, 36, 39 and 53 have been amended. Claims 35, 36 and 40 have been cancelled. No new matter has been added.

On page 2, the Official Action rejects claims 39 and 53 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner states that the phrase "similar" renders the claim indefinite. Thus, Applicants have amended claims 39 and 53 to replace the phrase "similar" with the phrase "same." Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

On page 3, the Official Action rejects claims 1 and 35-53 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gabber (US 5,961,593) in view of Wootton (US 6,128,298). It is respectfully submitted, however, that these claims are patentable over the art of record for the reasons set forth below.

Applicants' invention, as recited by claim 1, includes features which are neither disclosed nor suggested by the art of record, namely:

**... wherein the information accessing section accesses the electronic equipment related information based on the stored electronic equipment identifier, the server using the electronic equipment related information to access the electronic equipment.**

Claim 1 relates to electronic equipment related information stored on the server. Specifically, the electronic equipment related information (e.g., port number and IP address) is used to access electronic equipment. Furthermore, the electronic equipment related information corresponds to an electronic equipment identifier. Support for this feature can be at least found in Fig. 18 and furthermore described on pages 38 and 39 of Applicants' specification. No new matter has been added.

In col. 6, Gabber discloses a system including a home computer (HC) which is able to anonymously browse server sites through a proxy (*"all routines are executed by central proxy system 110a which means that all users must send users specific information to central proxy server 110a."* Col. 13 of Gabber suggest that the proxy

server generates substitute identifiers to maintain anonymity of the user *"resides in user site 105a, transmits the substitute identifiers to central proxy system 110a. Central proxy system 110a then retransmits a substitute identifiers to the server site 110g and thereafter communicates ... information ... between user site 105a to server site 110g"*).

Enclosed is an Explanatory Figure of Gabber's system. Specifically, the Explanatory Figure is in reference to Gabber's Fig. 1 where HC 105(a) is communicating with server 110(g) through proxy 110(a). During communication, home computer 105(a) generates and transmits a substitute identifier to the proxy 110a. Proxy 110a then relays the substitute identifier to the server. Substitute identifiers are then utilized for communication (See steps 1 through 4). In the entire process, the substitute identifier is used to communicate between the devices. This feature is at least supported in col. 13, lines 25-45 of Gabber (*"the first routine ... resides on user site 105a, constructs substitute identifiers ... the second routine ... resides in user site 105a, transmits the substitute identifiers to the central proxy system 110a. Central proxy system 110a then retransmits the substitute identifiers to server site 110g and therefore communicates ... information ... between user site 105a to server site 110g. This configuration is particularly advantageous when users may not trust central proxy system 110a"*). Thus, proxy 110a and server 110g in Gabber's system do not have electronic equipment related information stored for accessing the home computer (they only know the substitute identifier).

In similar art, col. 5, lines 35-55 of Wootton suggests a translation table which translates addresses for packets being sent over a network. Wootton, however, does not suggest electronic equipment related information corresponding to a stored electronic equipment identifier. Furthermore, even if Wootton did suggest electronic equipment related information, the combination of Gabber and Wootton would still be deficient (Gabber does not, and would not, use electronic equipment related information to access the home computer because it is already using the substitute identifier). Gabber's home computer does not trust the proxy, and therefore would not provide the electronic equipment related information to the proxy.

Applicants' claim 1 is different than the art of record, because electronic equipment related information is accessed on the server based on a corresponding electronic equipment identifier. Furthermore, the electronic equipment related information is used to access the electronic equipment ("*... wherein the information accessing section accesses the electronic equipment related information based on the stored electronic equipment identifier, the server using electronic equipment related information to access the electronic equipment.*").

As shown in Applicants' Fig. 18 and described on page 39 of the specification, the electronic equipment identifier and electronic equipment related information are stored on a server (please see Applicants' Explanatory Figure enclosed). In Step 1), the HC sends index information to the server. In Step 2), the index information is utilized by the server device to obtain the HC identifier. In Step 3), the HC identifier is utilized by the server device to obtain the HC information (e.g., port number and IP address). In Step 4), the server utilizes the HC information to access the HC (server utilizes the port number and IP address to access/control the computer). Thus, the index information transmitted by the HC is utilized by the server to access the electronic equipment information (port number and IP address) in order to access the HC. Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above, claim 1 is patentable over the art of record.

Independent claims 36 and 39 have similar features to claim 1. Thus, independent claims 36 and 39 are also patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above.

Dependent claims 38 and 41-53 include all the features of the claims from which they depend. Thus, these claims are also patentable over the art of record for the reasons set forth above.


Application No.: 10/528,978  
Amendment Dated: January 29, 2010  
Reply to Office Action of: November 12, 2009

MAT-8680US

In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, the above-identified application is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

RatnerPrestia



Lawrence E. Ashery, Reg. No. 34,515  
Attorney for Applicants

RAE/dmw/fp


Dated: January 29, 2010

P.O. Box 980  
Valley Forge, PA 19482  
(610) 407-0700

MJC\_585745\_1


# Gabber

(See Gabber's Fig1)



**EXPLANATORY FIGURE  
DO NOT ENTER**

# Applicant



**EXPLANATORY FIGURE  
DO NOT ENTER**